

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application.

**Section 103(a) Rejections**

In the office action, claims 1, 2-4, 6, 8-13, and 15-17 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Word Reference in view of Gibson (U.S. Patent Number 6,313,854) (hereinafter referred to as "Gibson"). Claim 5 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Word Reference in view of Gibson, and further in view of Park et al. (U.S. patent number 6,064,951). Claims 7 and 14 were rejected under section 103(a) as unpatentable over Word Reference in view of Gibson, and further in view of "Welcome to the new R-O-Matic Italian/English Dictionary." Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Independent claim 1 recites, among other elements, "*a translation window that is created by a program associated with a primary web page and is opened in conjunction with a web page window containing a secondary web page wherein the translation window and the web page window are positioned and sized so that the translation window and the web page window fit on one screen without overlapping.*" Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not teach or suggest this claim element.

Examiner concedes that Word Reference is silent on the element of "*opened in conjunction with a web page window containing a secondary web page wherein the translation window and the web page window are positioned and sized so that the translation window and the web page window fit on one screen without overlapping,*" and cited Gibson as teaching that element (citing to figure 7 items 112c, 112a, column 8 lines 50-51, column 9 lines 35-38).

Gibson discusses a method of converting frames of a single web page into multiple windows, and enabling window operations for each of the "windowed" frames. The frames in the web page are indicated by HTML FRAMSET tags.

Applicant submits that such teachings fail to disclose or suggest the embodiment of claim 1, which includes "*the translation window and the web page window fit on one screen without overlapping.*"

In this embodiment, a translation *window* is created by a program hosted by a primary web page, and is opened in conjunction with a web page *window* containing a secondary web page selected by an user. The translation window and the web page window are automatically sized and positioned so that they simultaneously fit on one user visible screen without overlapping.

In contrast, Gibson is concerned with converting *frames* in a single web page into multiple windows to enable an user to resize, minimize, or maximize each frame (column 8, lines 50-54). Gibson discusses two ways of implementing the conversion. The first way is to convert frames in a single web page into multiple child windows of a single parent browser window, where these "windowed" frames can be tiled, cascaded or overlapped within the single parent browser window (figure 6; figure 7; column 8, lines 24-26). In contrast, the translation window and the web page window are not child windows of a single parent browser window. Thus, Gibson does not disclose nor suggest positioning and sizing the translation *window* and the web page *window* so that "*the translation window and the web page window fit on one screen without overlapping.*" The second way is to generate a separate parent browser window for each frame (column 9, lines 37-40). However, Gibson does not discuss the positioning of these separate parent browsers, much less the claimed logic for positioning and sizing the translation *window* and the web page *window* so that "*the translation window and the web page window fit on one screen without overlapping.*"

For at least the reasons stated above, the cited references, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the features of claim 1. Hence, claim 1 should be allowable over Word Reference and Gibson.

Independent claims 10 and 11 include similar limitations to claim 1, and the applicant therefore respectfully submits that claims 10 and 11 should be allowable for at least similar reasons.

Appl. No. 09/617,169  
Amdt. dated October 8, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of June 28, 2004

PATENT


Dependent claims 2-9 (dependent from claim 1) and 12-17 (dependent from claim 11) should be allowable for at least similar reasons as the independent claims they depend from.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, applicants believe all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal notice of allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400, extension 5213.

Respectfully submitted,



Melvin D. Chan  
Reg. No. 39,626

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 650-326-2400 Fax: 650-326-2422  
60276292 v1